



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/840,083	05/06/2004	Michael Borella	08-968	7848
20306 7590 04/27/2011 MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP 300 S. WACKER DRIVE 32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER NICKERSON, JEFFREY L.				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2442				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/27/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/840,083

Applicant(s)

BORELLA ET AL.

Examiner

JEFFREY NICKERSON

Art Unit

2442

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29, 33, 35-49 and 66-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 43-49 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29, 33, 35-49 and 66-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Application No. 10/840,083 filed on 06 May 2004. The response presented on 25 January 2011, which amends claims 1, 10, 18-19, 29, 66, and 76-85, and presents arguments, is hereby acknowledged. Claims 1-29, 33, 35-49, and 66-85 are currently pending; claims 43-49 remain withdrawn from consideration; claims 1-29, 33, 35-49, and 66-85 are subject to examination.

35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's amendments and arguments, presented in the response dated 25 January 2011, with respect to the rejections under 35 USC 101 have been fully considered and are persuasive. All outstanding rejections under 35 USC 101 are hereby withdrawn.

35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim Rejections

5. Claims 66-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 66, apparatus claim elements “means for determining”, “means for receiving”, “means for storing”, “means for determining”, “means for determining”, and “means for determining” are means plus function limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. However, the written description fails to clearly link or associate the disclosed structure, material, or acts to the claimed function such that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function. While applicant’s disclosure discusses a memory and a SIP engine of a SIP proxy configured for different modes (Applicant specification: [0023]-[0030]), such a disclosure does not clearly link which components of the SIP proxy (specific combinations of hardware structure and/or software structure) link to which particular means of the claimed invention.

Applicant is required to:

- (a) Amend the claim so that the claim limitation will no longer be a means (or step) plus function limitation under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph; or

(b) Amend the written description of the specification such that it clearly links or associates the corresponding structure, material, or acts to the claimed function without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)); or

(c) State on the record where the corresponding structure, material, or acts are set forth in the written description of the specification that perform the claimed function. For more information, see 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2181.

Regarding claims 67-75, these claims do not cure the deficiencies of their parent claim(s) and, therefore, inherit the rejection.

35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's claim amendments and arguments, filed in the response dated 25 January 2011, regarding the rejections under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are at least persuasive-in-part. All outstanding rejections under 35 USC 103(a) are hereby withdrawn. However, new rejections may appear below.

Claim Rejections

8. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 14-15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-26, 29, 33, 35-38, 66-71, and 76-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crockett et al (US 2003/0154243 A1); and in further view of Chambert (US 2003/0216140 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Crockett teaches a first SIP proxy (local regional dispatcher and location server), configured to: support routing of communications for a first plurality of clients in a first region (Crockett: [0058] provides the regional dispatcher performs call routing; See [0041] for RD and RLS being SIP based), wherein the communications comprise push-to-talk communications (Crockett: [0002] provides for comm. being PTT);

wherein a first client of the first plurality of clients is configured to register with a second SIP proxy (Home location server and home dispatcher) and optionally with the first SIP proxy (local regional location server and local regional dispatcher) (Crockett: [0050]-[0067] for registering with RD and RLS, and HD and HLS);

wherein the first SIP proxy is further configured to: determine whether the first client is registered with the first SIP proxy (Crockett: [0067] provides the RD can determine if a user is registered with itself or not), and,

in response to determining that the first client is registered with the first SIP proxy:

determine whether or not a PTT communication originated by the first client is local to the first region, based at least in part on the stored value of

locations (Crockett: [0104]-[0105] for determining if call is intra-regional based on location information; [0096] provides location may be the IP address);

set up the a PTT communication in the first region responsive to determining the PTT communication is local (Crockett: [0106]-[0111] for intra-regional call setup when originator and targets are in same region);

set up the PTT communication in the second region responsive to determining the PTT communication is not local (Crockett: [0122] provides setting up the call in remote region when call is not local).

While Crockett determines whether a call is intra-regional, ie local, based on cached location information (Crockett: [0104]-[0105]) and that such cached information may be domain name information (Crockett: [0070]), he fails to explicitly recite determining whether a communication is local based on a stored value of a local domain.

Chambert, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches determining whether a communication is local based on a stored value of a local domain (Chambert: Figure 7, all steps; [0035]-[0038] provides for retrieving routing information and IP based on FQDN of the domain).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Chambert for using an FQDN for representing the location. The teachings of Chambert, when implemented in the Crockett system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to cache location information in the form of FQDNs. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the

teachings of Chambert in the Crockett system in order to make the location information of the mobile device stored in a form that is instantly readable to humans.

Regarding claim 2, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the first SIP proxy comprises at least two SIP proxies (Crockett: See [0041] for access being SIP proxy; Chambert: Figure 2, items 110 for access node of location area 1 being at least two access nodes)

Regarding claim 3, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein determining the push-to-talk communication is local comprises determining that a called party specified in a request for push-to-talk communication is local (Crockett: [0104]-[0105] for determining if call is intra-regional based on location information).

Regarding claim 5, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches further comprising a PTT server, wherein the PTT server is operably connected to the at least two SIP proxies (Crockett: [0072]-[0083] for MCU hosting PTT sessions and being connected to access nodes; See also Figure 1).

Regarding claim 7, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein either the first region, the second region, or both the first region and the second region correspond to a wireless coverage area (Crockett: [0002]).

Regarding claim 8, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein a wireless coverage area as corresponds to the first region at least partially overlaps with a wireless coverage area as corresponds to the second region (Chambert: Figure 8).

Regarding claim 9, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches a wireless coverage area as corresponds to the first region and a wireless coverage areas as corresponds to the second region, and handing off therebetween (Chambert: Figure 8, [0040]-[0043]).

The Crockett/Chambert system does not explicitly recite that coverage areas can't overlap.

One of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would reasonably recognize that there are a finite number of options when it comes to identifying how coverage areas inter-relate to one another with respect to an overlapping trait. Coverage areas can either overlap or they can not overlap. One of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize the benefits and detriments of either scenario, such as: overlapping allows continuous communication at the expense of smaller overall coverage; non-overlapping allows larger overall coverage at the expense of non-continuous communication when traveling between areas. Given that there are a known finite number of options with regard to overlapping-ness of coverage areas, with recognizable and predictable outcomes as indicated above, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use either technique in any particular system based on the system's particular needs.

Regarding claim 14, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the first SIP proxy is configured to support PTT styled communications for roaming PTT clients in the first region (Crockett: [0038]).

Regarding claim 15, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the first SIP proxy is configured to support inter-region PTT communications between PTT clients that are located in different regions (Crockett: [0105]; [0120]).

Regarding claim 17, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the first SIP proxy is further configured to serve as a registrar for at least some of the first plurality of clients (Crockett: [0010]).

Regarding claim 18, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the first region comprises a plurality of PTT service domains individual of the PTT service domains having a corresponding URI domain name (Chambert: [0031]-[0033]).

Regarding claim 19, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the first region comprises a first PTT service domain of a PTT service, wherein the PTT service comprises a plurality of PTT service domains that includes the first PTT service domain, and wherein each of the plurality of PTT service domains is configured to be identified by a corresponding URI domain name (Chambert: [0030]-[0033]).

Regarding claim 21, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the first SIP proxy further comprises authentication and registration means for facilitating authentication of the first plurality of clients (Crockett: [0010]); and

wherein at least some of the first plurality of clients are PTT clients (Crockett: [0013]).

Regarding claim 22, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the authentication and registration means are further for serving as a registrar for mobile clients (Crockett: [0010]-[0013]).

Regarding claim 24, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the first SIP proxy further comprises routing means for making routing decisions for SIP messages as are provided thereto (Crockett: [0104]-[0105] for routing as local or remote).

Regarding claim 25, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the routing means facilitate routing decisions in conjunction with a directory server (Crockett: [0103]-[0104] for user lookup directory).

Regarding claim 26, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the routing means make the routing decisions for all SIP messages as are provided thereto (Crockett: [0103]-[0104] provides it is for all calls).

Regarding claim 29, this method claim contains limitations corresponding to that of claim 1 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 33, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the first SIP proxy comprises a plurality of SIP proxies (Crockett: See [0041] for access being SIP proxy; Chambert: Figure 2, items 110 for access node of location area 1 being at least two access nodes); and

wherein the first region comprises a plurality of PTT domains (Chambert: Figure 2, multiple cells of location area 1; [0030]); and

wherein the system further comprises assigning at least some of the plurality of SIP proxies to different PTT domains in the plurality of PTT domains (Chambert: [0030]-[0032] provides different access nodes are allocated to different domains).

Regarding claim 35, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the SIP message facilitates a PTT communication for the first client further comprises a SIP message facilitating a wireless PTT communication for the first client (Crockett: [0002]).

Regarding claim 36, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein the SIP message facilitating a PTT communication for the first client further comprises a SIP message facilitating a wireline PTT communication for the first client (Crockett: [0038]).

Regarding claim 37, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches further comprising upon receiving the SIP message from the first client, automatically authenticating the first client via the at least one SIP proxy (Crockett: [0099]).

Regarding claim 38, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches wherein automatically authenticating the first client comprises using an authentication server (Crockett: [0147]).

Regarding claims 66-71 and 76-81, these claims contain limitations found within that of claims 29, 33, and 35-38, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale where applicable.

9. Claims 4, 6, 10, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crockett et al (US 2003/0154243 A1); in view of Chambert (US 2003/0216140 A1); and in further view of Gallant (US 2002/0165969 A1).

Regarding claim 4, the Crockett/Chambert system does not teach further comprising:
wherein the at least one client in the first plurality of clients is enabled with a first user identifier and a second user identifier, wherein the first user identifier is a standard SIP uniform resource identifier and the second user identifier is a telecommunications URI, and wherein the at least one client is able to use the first user identifier and the second user identifier interchangeably.

Gallant, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches Gallant system teaches wherein the at least one client in the first plurality of clients is enabled with a first user identifier and a second user identifier (Gallant: Figure 3), wherein the first user identifier is a standard SIP URI (Gallant: Figure 3, JDoe@com.com) and the second user identifier is a telecommunications URI (Gallant: [0008]; Figure 3, item 304); and wherein at least one client is able to use the first user identifier and the second user identifier interchangeably (Gallant: abstract; [0071]-[0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gallant for a proxy performing user aliasing. The teachings of Gallant, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to have each proxy resolve both "to" and "from" user aliasing. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Gallant in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to reduce user confusion by automating the manipulation of multiple account identifiers and to make AAA more efficient.

Regarding claim 6, the Crockett/Chambert system fails to explicitly teach wherein at least some of the second plurality of clients each have a plurality of differing user identifier and, wherein, for at least one of the second plurality of clients, at least two of the plurality of differing user identifiers correspond to a same communication service.

Gallant, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein at least some of the second plurality of clients each have a plurality of differing user identifier and, wherein,

for at least one of the second plurality of clients, at least two of the plurality of differing user identifiers correspond to a same communication service (Gallant: Figure 3; abstract; [0071]-[0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gallant for a proxy performing user aliasing. The teachings of Gallant, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to have each proxy resolve both "to" and "from" user aliasing. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Gallant in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to reduce user confusion by automating the manipulation of multiple account identifiers and to make AAA more efficient.

Regarding claim 10, the Crockett/Chambert system teaches further comprising a fourth SIP proxy dedicated, at least in part, to supporting routing of communications for a third plurality of clients in a third region (Chambert: figure 1, different access networks; Crockett: [0122] provides for any number of regions).

The Crockett/Chambert system fails to teach wherein at least some of the third plurality of clients each have a plurality of differing user identifiers; or

wherein, for at least one of the third plurality of clients, at least two of the plurality of differing user identifiers each corresponds to a same communication service.

Gallant, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein at least some of the third plurality of clients each have a plurality of differing user identifiers (Gallant: Figure 3, abstract; [0071]-[0075]); and

wherein, for at least one of the third plurality of clients, at least two of the plurality of differing user identifiers each corresponds to a same communication service (Gallant: Figure 3; abstract; [0071]-[0075]; [0052]-[0054]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gallant for a proxy performing user aliasing. The teachings of Gallant, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to have each proxy resolve both "to" and "from" user aliasing. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Gallant in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to reduce user confusion by automating the manipulation of multiple account identifiers and to make AAA more efficient.

Regarding claim 23, the Crockett/Chambert fails to explicitly teach wherein the authentication and registration means are further for accommodating a PTT client that presents either of at least two different available-to-the-client URIs.

Gallant teaches wherein the authentication and registration means are further for accommodating a PTT client that presents either of at least two different available-to-the-client URIs (Gallant: abstract; [0071]-[0076]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gallant for a proxy performing user aliasing. The teachings of Gallant, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to have each proxy resolve both "to" and "from" user aliasing. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Gallant in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to reduce user confusion by automating the manipulation of multiple account identifiers and to make AAA more efficient.

10. Claims 11-13, 16, 20, 27-28, 39-42, 72-75, and 82-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crockett et al (US 2003/0154243 A1); in view of Chambert (US 2003/0216140 A1); and in further view of Denman (US 7,170,863 B1).

Regarding claim 11, the Crockett/Chambert system fails to teach wherein the first SIP proxy is configured to support SIP compression.

Denman, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the first SIP proxy is configured to support SIP compression (Denman: col 13, lines 47-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Denman for supporting SIP compression. The teachings of Denman, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to implement various SIP technologies in a PTT environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings

of Denman in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to provide adequate support for commonly used SIP technologies.

Regarding claim 12, the Crockett/Chambert/Denman system teaches wherein the first SIP proxy is configured to support SIP compression to thereby improve airlink utilization (Denman: col 13, lines 47-50).

Regarding claim 13, the Crockett/Chambert/Denman system teaches wherein the first SIP proxy comprises a first hop SIP proxy with respect to a given client in the plurality of clients (Crockett: Figure 4, regional dispatcher is first hop); and
wherein the given client is a PTT client (Crockett: [0002]).

Regarding claim 16, the Crockett/Chambert system fails to teach wherein the second SIP proxy is further configured to publish presence information about at least some of the second plurality of clients.

Denman, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the second SIP proxy is further configured to publish presence information about at least some of the second plurality of clients (Denman: claim 1, col 19, lines 56 – col 20, line 33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Denman for supporting SIP presence information. The teachings of Denman, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to implement various SIP technologies

in a PTT environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Denman in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to provide adequate support for commonly used SIP technologies.

Regarding claim 20, the Crockett/Chambert system fails to teach wherein the user identifiers for the first plurality of clients have at least one domain and a subdomain name that is distinct from any domain name and subdomain, respectively, as is assigned to any network component in the system.

Denman, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the user identifiers for the first plurality of clients have at least one domain and a subdomain name that is distinct from any domain name and subdomain, respectively, as is assigned to any network component in the system (Denman: col 16, lines 40-45 for SIP user@IP identifier).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Denman for supporting a unique SIP identifier for a user. The teachings of Denman, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to implement various SIP technologies in a PTT environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Denman in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to provide adequate support for commonly used SIP technologies.

Regarding claim 27, the Crockett/Chambert system fails to teach wherein the first SIP proxy further comprises compression means for compressing and decompressing SIP traffic to and from a corresponding one of the PTT clients.

Denman, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the first SIP proxy further comprises compression means for compressing and decompressing SIP traffic to and from a corresponding one of the PTT clients (Denman: col 13, lines 47-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Denman for supporting SIP compression/decompression. The teachings of Denman, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to implement various SIP technologies in a PTT environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Denman in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to provide adequate support for commonly used SIP technologies.

Regarding claim 28, the Crockett/Chambert system fails to teach wherein the first SIP proxy further comprises presence means for supporting presence within the system, at least in part, by supporting SIP/SIMPLE messages.

Denman, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the first SIP proxy further comprises presence means for supporting presence within the system, at least in part, by supporting SIP/SIMPLE messages (Denman: Figure 6, subscribe and notify messages).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Denman for supporting SIP compression/decompression. The teachings of Denman, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to implement various SIP technologies in a PTT environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Denman in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to provide adequate support for commonly used SIP technologies.

Regarding claim 39, the Crockett/Chambert system fails to explicitly teach further comprising: in response to receiving the SIP message from the first client, automatically decompressing the SIP message.

Denman, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches further comprising: in response to receiving the SIP message from the first client, automatically decompressing the SIP message (Denman: col 15, lines 28-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Denman for supporting SIP compression/decompression. The teachings of Denman, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to implement various SIP technologies in a PTT environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Denman in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to provide adequate support for commonly used SIP technologies.

Regarding claim 40, the Crockett/Chambert system fails to teach further comprising compressing the SIP message from the first client to generate a compressed SIP communication.

Denman, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches further comprising compressing the SIP message from the first client to generate a compressed SIP communication (Denman: col 15, lines 28-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Denman for supporting SIP compression/decompression. The teachings of Denman, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to implement various SIP technologies in a PTT environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Denman in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to provide adequate support for commonly used SIP technologies.

Regarding claim 41, the Crockett/Chambert/Denman system teaches further comprising sending the compressed SIP communication (Denman: col 15, lines 28-37).

Regarding claim 42, the Crockett/Chambert system fails to explicitly teach further comprising upon receiving the SIP message from the first client, automatically publishing presence information about the first client.

Denman, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches further comprising upon receiving the SIP message from the first client, automatically publishing presence information about the first client (Denman: col 19, line 56 – col 20, line 33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Denman for supporting SIP presence publishing. The teachings of Denman, when implemented in the Crockett/Chambert system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to implement various SIP technologies in a PTT environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Denman in the Crockett/Chambert system in order to provide adequate support for commonly used SIP technologies.

Regarding claims 72-75 and 82-85, these claims contain limitations found within that of claims 39-42, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale where applicable.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY NICKERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 9:00am - 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey Nickerson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2442